



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/282,320	03/31/1999	JACQUELYN ANNETTE MARTINO	PHA23.646	8425

7590 07/02/2002
US PHILIPS CORPORATION
CORPARTE PATENT COUNSEL
580 WHITE PLAINS RD
TARRYTOWN, NY 10591

EXAMINER

ENG, GEORGE

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2643

DATE MAILED: 07/02/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

UB

Advisory Action

Application No.

09/282,320

Applicant(s)

MARTINO ET AL.

Examiner

George Eng

Art Unit

2643

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 18 June 2002 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]

- a) ☐ The period for reply expires _____ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b) ☒ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1. ☒ A Notice of Appeal was filed on 18 June 2002. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.
2. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:
- (a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
- (b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);
- (c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
- (d) ☐ they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____

3. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
4. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
5. ☒ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☒ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: see attachment.
6. ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.
7. ☒ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) ☐ will not be entered or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: _____.

Claim(s) objected to: _____.

Claim(s) rejected: 1-20.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

8. ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is a) ☐ approved or b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
9. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____.
10. ☐ Other: _____


CURTIS KURTZ
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
ROOM CENTER 2600

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments filed 6/18/2002 (paper no. 12) have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In response to Applicant's argument, there is some typo error: page 3, line 14, "reflection surface" should be --lens surface-- to be corrected.

In response to Applicant's argument the arrangement of the mirror in the presently claimed invention not require placement over the lens, it appears that the claimed language does not clearly define to exclude the arrangement of the mirror to place over the lens. Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

In response to applicant's argument on claims 1, 11 and 15 that the mirror has a reflection surface substantially greater than the lens surface, it appears that Kamaya clearly teaches that the mirror (42) as shown in figure 19 having a reflection surface substantially greater than the lens surface (5). Thus, the rejection is maintained.

In response to applicant's argument that Kamaya fails to suggest to align a mirror to provide a mirror image because the mirror is fixed, it appears that the claimed language fails to clearly define how to align the mirror, i.e., to align only the mirror without moving the camera. Note while Kamaya clearly teaches to use the mirror as a viewfinder for viewing an object to be recorded (col. 5 lines 23-26) so that it would have been obvious to align the mirror and the camera with a field of view. Thus, the claims would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art over Kamaya.